

### **REMARKS**

The present Amendment amends claims 3, 5, 8, 13 and 15, cancels claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 10-12, 16 and 17 and leaves claims 4, 9 and 14 unchanged. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 3-5, 8, 9 and 13-15.

Claim 5 stands objected to due informalities noted by the Examiner in the Office Action. Amendments were made to claim 5 to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. Therefore, this objection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-3, 6, 10, 11, 13, 16 and 17 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(a) as being anticipated by Mulahusic (articled entitled "SIP Issues in Dual-stack Environments"); claims 4, 7, 8 and 16 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Mulahusic; claim 5 stands rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Zhang (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0001509); claim 15 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zhang in view of Valli (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0160183). As indicated above, claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 10-12, 16 and 17 were canceled. Therefore, these rejections with respect to claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 10-12, 16 and 17 is rendered moot. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

It should be noted that the cancellation of claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 10-12, 16 and 17 was not intended nor should it be considered as an agreement on Applicants part that the features recited in claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 10-12, 16 and 17 are taught or suggested by any of the references of record whether taken individually or in combination with each other. The cancellation of claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 10-12, 16 and 17 was simply intended to expedite prosecution of the

present application. Applicants hereby reserve their right to pursue the subject matter as set forth in claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 10-12, 16 and 17 in a continuing application.

These rejections with respect to the remaining claims 3-5, 8, 9 and 13-15 are traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention as now recited in claims 3-5, 8, 9 and 13-15 are not taught or suggested by Mulahusic, Zhang or Valli whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw these rejections with respect to claims 3-5, 8, 9 and 13-15.

Amendments were made to the claims to more clearly describe features of the present invention as recited in the claims. Particularly, amendments were made to the claims to recite that the present invention is directed to session control system, a session control terminal connected to a session control system via an IP network and capable of communicating using IPv4 protocol and communicating using the IPv6 protocol, and a network system including an IP network, communication terminals connected to the IP network and a session control system connected to the IP network.

According to the present invention the session control system includes a control unit for performing a process of establishing a session between communication terminals connected to an IP network, a receiving unit for receiving, from a first communication terminal, a session control request packet to a second communication terminal and a transmitting unit for transmitting a notification to the first communication terminal if an IP protocol

version of the session control request packet is different from an IP protocol version usable by the second communication terminal.

Further, according to the present invention the receiving unit receives a packet having each of registration information for an IPv4 terminal and registration information for an IPv6 terminal.

Thus, according to the present invention a packet including both registration information for an IPv6 terminal and registration information for an IPv4 terminal is communicated in advance to a session establishing procedure.

According to the present invention, both the IP address registration required for setting up a session of IPv4 protocol and the IP address registration required for setting up a session of IPv6 protocol are completed by once IPv4/IPv6 dual registration process. See Figs. 5 and 6 of the present application.

The above described features of the present invention now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by any of the references of record whether said references are taken individually or in combination with each other. Particularly, the above described features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by Mulahusic, Zhang of Valli whether said references are taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner.

Mulahusic discloses in Scenario 1 on pages 2 and 3 thereof that a host initiating the session is registered with its SIP server with both IPv4 and IPv6 addresses. However, Mulahusic does not disclose a communication

sequence of registering IPv4 address and IPv6 address in a receiving unit as in the present invention as recited in the claims.

Specifically, at no point is there any teaching or suggestion in Mulahusic of the dual registration of an IPv4 terminal and an IPv6 terminal such as illustrated in Fig. 5 of the present application as step 81.

Thus, Mulahusic fails to teach or suggest a receiving unit for receiving, from a first communication terminal, a session control request packet to a second communication terminal and a transmitting unit for transmitting a notification to the first communication terminal if an IP protocol version of the session control request packet is different from an IP protocol version usable by the second communication terminal as recited in the claims.

Further, Mulahusic fails to teach or suggest that the receiving unit receives a packet having each of registration information for an IPv4 terminal and registration information for an IPv6 terminal as recited in the claims.

Therefore, Mulahusic fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims and as such does not anticipate nor render obvious the claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §102(a) rejection of claims 3 and 13 as being anticipated by Mulahusic and reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 4 and 8 as being unpatentable over Mulahusic is respectfully requested.

The above described deficiencies of Mulahusic are not supplied by any of the other references of record. Particularly, the above described deficiencies of Mulahusic are not supplied by Zhang or Valli.

Zhang discloses in the Abstract that a session between an IPv4 node and an IPv6 node is controlled through a network address translator-protocol translator (NAT-PT). However, like Mulahusic, Zhang also fails to teach or suggest the above described features of the present invention as recited in the claims.

Valli discloses in the Abstract that a tunnel broker supports IPv4 and IPv6 and assigns to an IPv4 node a unique IPv6 address generated using a combination of the IPv4 address of the node and a counter value, and that the counter value is incremented so that each user sharing an IPv4 address is allocated a unique IPv6 address. However, like Mulahusic and Zang, Valli fails to teach or suggest the above described features of the present invention as recited in the claims.

Thus, as is clear from the above each of Zhang and Valli, the same as Mulahusic, fails to teach or suggest a receiving unit for receiving, from a first communication terminal, a session control request packet to a second communication terminal and a transmitting unit for transmitting a notification to the first communication terminal if an IP protocol version of the session control request packet is different from IP protocol version usable by the second communication terminal as recited in the claims.

Further, each of Zhang and Valli, the same as Mulahusic, fails to teach or suggest that the receiving unit receives a packet having each of registration information for an IPv4 terminal and registration information for an IPv6 terminal as recited in the claims.

Therefore, since each of Zhang and Valli, the same as Mulahusic, fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly

recited in the claims, each of Zhang and Valli whether taken individually or in combination with each other does not anticipate nor render obvious the claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §102(e) rejection of claim 5 as being anticipated by Zhang and reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 15 as being unpatentable over Zhang in view of Valli is respectfully requested.

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the references utilized in the rejection of claims 1-17.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 3-5, 8, 9 and 13-15 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of the present application based on claims 3-5, 8, 9 and 13-15 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (NIT-408).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.

/Carl I. Brundidge/  
Carl I. Brundidge  
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc  
(703) 684-1120